arXiv:1409.8198v1 [stat.ME] 29 Sep 2014

A procedure to detect general association based on concentration of ranks

Pratyaydipta Rudra

Department of Biostatistics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Fred A. Wright †

North Carolina State University Bioinformatics Research Center

Summary. In modern high-throughput applications, it is important to identify pairwise associations between variables, and desirable to use methods that are powerful and sensitive to a variety of association relationships. We describe RankCover, a new non-parametric association test for association between two variables that measures the concentration of paired ranked points. Here 'concentration' is quantified using a disk-covering statistic that is similar to those employed in spatial data analysis. Analysis of simulated datasets demonstrates that the method is robust and often powerful in comparison to competing general association tests. We illustrate RankCover in the analysis of several real datasets.

Keywords: General Association; Rank-based Test; Test of Independence

1. Introduction

The need for statistical methods to identify general pairwise association is increasingly recognized, as evidenced by recent attention to methods such as distance correlation (dCor) (Székely, Rizzo, and Bakirov, 2007; Székely and Rizzo, 2009), Maximal Information Coefficient (MIC) (Reshef, Reshef, Finucane, Grossman, McVean, Turnbaugh, Lander, Mitzenmacher, and Sabeti, 2011), and the Heller-Heller-Gorfine (HHG) method (Heller, Heller, and Gorfine, 2013). The term *general association* refers to any departure from independence among random variables, and methods differ in the types of departures to which they are sensitive. The need for general association tests is perhaps greatest for analysis of large datasets, for which discovery-based approaches are needed, without prior hypotheses

†*Address for correspondence:* Fred A. Wright, NCSU Bioinformatics Research Center, 2601 Stinson Drive, Campus Box 7566, Raleigh, NC 27695. E-mail: fred_wright@ncsu.edu

regarding the form or structure of dependence. In addition to the need to test dependence among pairs of variables as a primary analysis, dependencies can invalidate inference for downstream methods that require independence among input variables (Albert, Ratnasinghe, Tangrea, and Wacholder, 2001).

Standard parametric and non-parametric tests of association, such as linear trend testing (Mann, 1945; Kendall, 1975; Cuzick, 1985; Hamed and Ramachandra Rao, 1998), are sensitive to only specific alternatives, while classical tests of association ((Wilks, 1935) (Puri and Sen, 1971) are not distribution free. Recent work has tried to capture the measure of association through a generalized correlation coefficient, which is able to capture numerous forms of relationships. MIC (Reshef, Reshef, Finucane, Grossman, McVean, Turnbaugh, Lander, Mitzenmacher, and Sabeti, 2011) and dCor (Székely, Rizzo, and Bakirov, 2007; Székely and Rizzo, 2009) are two recently introduced measures of general association. HHG (Heller, Heller, and Gorfine, 2013) has been shown to be powerful against many alternatives, and also shown to be consistent, in the sense of having increasing power with sample size n, against all dependent alternatives. However its performance in small to moderate samples against varying alternatives has not been studied.

In providing motivation for MIC, Reshef, Reshef, Finucane, Grossman, McVean, Turnbaugh, Lander, Mitzenmacher, and Sabeti (2011) showed that it is *equitable* in the sense that the value of the coefficient is similar for various forms of association that are equally "noisy" in their departure from a functional relationship. However, Simon and Tibshirani (2014) argued that such equitability makes the procedure less powerful in a number of situations, and that the distance correlation (dCor) is in fact more powerful in almost all of a variety of simulated associations that they studied. A potential weakness of dCor is that it is not powerful to detect nonmonotone relationships, such as a circle (de Siqueira Santos, Takahashi, Nakata, and Fujita, 2013), and the detection of such relationships is a primary motivation to develop methods for general association. To gain insight into why dCor loses power in case of nonmonotone alternatives, it is helpful to consider dCor from a geometric point of view. dCor is motivated by consideration of distances of the empirical characteristic function under the null vs. under the alternative. For observed data, the dCor statistic is the Pearson correlation of distances (after some adjustments) between all pairs of samples. For an observed random sample $(x, y) = (x_k, y_k) : k = 1, 2, ..., n$, the distances between pairs of samples are defined as $a_{kl} = |x_k - x_l|$ and $b_{kl} = |y_k - y_l|$; $k, l = 1, 2, ..., n$. The approach is intuitively sensible when the relationship is monotone, as sample pairs that are close on the x-axis should also be close on the y-axis. However, for non-monotone

relationships, pairs of points that are close on the x-axis can be quite distant on the y-axis (Figure 1).



Fig. 1: *Illustration of paired adjusted distances underlying dCor. (top row) Illustration of dCor for a quadratic relationship between x and y.(bottom row) A circular relationship between x and y. The adjusted paired distances show little correlation.*

Another way to approach the general association problem is to consider spatial randomness of points (x_k, y_k), and the proposed tests of general association attempt to be sensitive to alternatives in which the points are clustered or otherwise closer to each other than expected under no association. A class of testing procedures sensitive to local clustering has been devised in the field of spatial statistics (Clark and Evans, 1954; Holgate, 1965b,a; Ripley, 1979; Smith, 2004). The F function by Diggle (Diggle, 1983) uses nearest neighbor distances to devise a test against the hypothesis of complete spatial randomness. Adapting these ideas from spatial analysis, we propose RankCover, a method that quantifies the concentration of (x, y) values by measuring the area covered by laying disks of a fixed radius over each point in the scatter plot of the ranks of the two variables. We demonstrate that RankCover is robust in the sense that it has power against a variety of alternatives, and regardless of the marginal distributions of the two variables. Moreover, RankCover has favorable power in comparison to dCor, MIC and HHG, and is especially useful for

detecting oscillating relationships. Simulations demonstrate that RankCover and dCor are in some sense complementary, and a hybrid of the two methods is a robust procedure that is powerful for most association types of interest.

2. Methods

2.1. Motivation

RankCover starts by computing ranks of the original x and y values, and we assume there are no tied values. The use of ranks considerably simplifies the problem, by placing the intervals between successive ranked values on a common scale. In addition, for ranked values, the null distribution depends only on the sample size n. Thus the only computation lies in computing the observed statistic, while the null distribution can be pre-computed and is applicable to any dataset of size n.

Diggle's $F(\delta)$ function as introduced in (Diggle, 1983) is the distribution function of the distance between a randomly chosen point in a region to the nearest observed point (x_k, y_k). To obtain an empirical estimate of the $F(\delta)$, the investigator conceptually lays disks of radius δ on each point (x_k, y_k) and calculates the proportion of the surrounding region covered by the union of the disks (Figure 2). If x and y are highly associated, the areas covered by the disks should be small, and therefore RankCover rejects only in the left tail of the statistic described below.

Different distance metrics can be used for this purpose and the shape of the disks depend on the choice of the distance metric. For instance, Euclidean distance leads to circular equidistance contours, resulting in circular disks, while the disks are diamond-shaped for Manhattan distance (Figure 2).

2.2. The test statistic

The empirical estimate of F can be obtained using the proportion of area covered by the disks. Acknowledging the discrete nature of the ranks, we consider only the $n \times n$ grid of possible rank pairs, $\{1, 2, ..., n\} \times \{1, 2, ..., n\}$, and whether each of these values on the grid is covered by at least one disk. Let (x_k, y_k) denote the ranks of the kth sample pair, $k = 1, 2, ..., n$.

DEFINITION 2.1. *Define* $d(i, j, x_k, y_k)$ = *distance between the point* (i, j) *on the grid and* (x_k, y_k)*;* $d_{ij} = \min_k d(i, j, x_k, y_k)$



Fig. 2: *Illustration of RankCover for sample size $n = 50$:* ***A.*** *Scatter plot of the two variables.* ***B.*** *Scatter plot on the rank scale* ***C.*** *Disks laid on the scatter plot on rank scale using Euclidian distance* ***D.*** *Disks laid on the scatter plot on rank scale using Manhattan distance.*

Using this definition, a reasonable statistic for fixed δ is

$$\hat{F}(\delta) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} I(d_{ij} \leq \delta),$$

where $I(.)$ is the indicator function.

The choice of disk size δ is an important consideration which has not been fully addressed in the spatial statistics literature. Diggle (1983) suggested computing the entire empirical curve $\hat{F}(\delta)$ to develop a new summary statistic to compare against the null curve. However, this approach makes the procedure prohibitively computationally expensive, and we propose (See Supplementary Article for details) using a fixed $\delta = \sqrt{n}$ for Euclidean distance (Section 2.3), with slight modification under Manhattan distance. In addition, we modify the statistic to account for edge effects of the grid, using an $(n + \lceil\delta\rceil) \times (n + \lceil\delta\rceil)$ grid extending beyond the range of the scatterplot. Here $\lceil\delta\rceil$ is the smallest integer greater than or equal to δ. Finally, our modified test statistic is

$$T(\delta) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1-\lceil\delta\rceil}^{n+\lceil\delta\rceil} \sum_{j=1-\lceil\delta\rceil}^{n+\lceil\delta\rceil} I(d_{ij} \leq \delta), \tag{2.1}$$

where the range of $\{i, j\}$ reflects the outer boundaries of a larger region to account for edge effects. The null distribution of T depends entirely on n, so tables based on simulated null distibutions can be precomputed for various sample sizes (See Supplementary Article).

2.3. Choice of parameters and distance metric

For the distance metric d, we consider here both Euclidian and Manhattan distances, for which later simulations show similar performance (See Supplementary Article). However, the Manhattan distance has advantages in approximating tail areas (See Supplementary Article). Therefore we recommend its use and here present results using Manhattan distance.

3. Results

We applied the RankCover method using the Manhattan metric to simulated and real datasets, following setups similar to Simon and Tibshirani (2014), investigating dCor, HHG, and MIC as competing approaches. The simulation results indicate that RankCover and dCor have some complementary characteristics, and so we additionally propose a hybrid statistic using results from RankCover and dCor. The hybrid method uses the minimum p-value from RankCover and rank-based dCor as a new statistic. In addition to simulated data, we illustrate all the approaches on several real datasets.

3.1. Simulation results

Following the simulation procedure used in Simon and Tibshirani (2014), we have simulated pairs of variables with several canonical dependency relationships (Figure 3) and with varying noise levels. In each scenario, the X values were simulated iid from a uniform distribution, while the noise distribution was Gaussian. However, the overall results were similar for other distributional forms (See Supplementary Article).

Figure 4 shows the power for the methods for various relationships, with varying noise levels, for sample size $n = 50$. Here the “noise level" is a scale quantity appropriate to each relationship form, following Simon and Tibshirani (2014) (See Supplementary Article). It is evident that RankCover performs better than MIC in all the situations we have considered. It is found to be more powerful than dCor and HHG in several cases while these methods are found to be more powerful in other cases. Even when dCor or HHG is more powerful, RankCover still has reasonable power to identify the association. Numerous illustrations provided in the supplementary article indicate that these observations hold



Fig. 3: *Showing the scatter plots for different relationships between the pair of variables (low noise level)*

true for varying sample sizes, levels of noise, and functional forms for the originating X and noise distributions.

A careful look into the results indicate that dCor is more powerful than RankCover when the type of association is monotone. When the relationship is non-monotone, dCor is typically not as powerful. We attribute this behavior to the fact that dCor is less sensitive to non-monotone relationships for the reasons described earlier. We have also shown that with monotone relationships the Spearman's rank correlation is as powerful as dCor (See Supplementary Article). Therefore, one might simply use Spearman's rank correlation if there is prior knowledge that the relationship is monotone. On the other hand, RankCover is more sensitive to local clustering of points rather than trends. Thus, it is powerful against even non-monotone relationships like cubic, circular or the "X" relationship.

These observations motivate the use of a hybrid method utilizing both RankCover and dCor, as the two methods appear powerful in different situations. Formally, a new statistic is defined $s_{hybrid} = \min(p_{dCor}, p_{RankCover})$, where $p_{RankCover}$ is the p-value obtained by



Fig. 4: *Showing the power of different methods (type-I $\alpha = 0.05$)against different relationships at varying noise levels.*

using RankCover, and p_{dCor} is that using dCor on $(rank(x), rank(y))$. The p-value for the hybrid method is $p_{hybrid} = P(S_{hybrid} \leq s_{hybrid})$. As with RankCover, the p-value can be obtained by using pre-computed simulations. The hybrid method, as expected, is always less powerful than the most powerful statistic for each scenario, but seems to be robust against all forms of association investigated.

The HHG method also appears to be relatively robust. However, the ability of RankCover and the hybrid method to detect periodic relationships and non-functional relationships makes it very useful against such alternatives. The fact that RankCover is especially powerful against periodic relationships will be reinforced by the results in Section 3.2.3 and

Section 3.2.4.

We summarize by emphasizing that RankCover and the hybrid method are powerful and robust in comparison to competing methods, and that these simulations cover a large range of relationships and noise levels. The broad conclusions are also not very sensitive to the marginal distributions of X and the error distributions (See Supplementary Article).

3.2. Real data

3.2.1. Example 1: Eckerle4 data

We show data from a study of circular interference transmittance (Eckerle, 1979) from the NIST Statistical Reference Datasets for non-linear regression. The data were analyzed by Székely and Rizzo (2009) to illustrate dCor, and contain 35 observations on the predictor variable wavelength and the response variable transmittance.

Figure 5 shows the scatter plot of the predictor and the response along with the fitted curve (NIST StRD for non-linear regression) based on the model

$$y = \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} exp\{\frac{(x-\beta_3)^2}{2\beta_2^2}\} + \epsilon,$$

where $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0, \beta_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ and ϵ is random Gaussian noise.



Fig. 5: *Showing the scatter plot and the fitted curve for the Eckerle4 dataset*

From the plot, it is evident that there is a very strong non-linear relationship between the two variables. For dCor, $p = 0.02072$, while MIC and HHG have p-values $< 10^{-5}$. The RankCover method and the hybrid method are also highly significant, with $p < 10^{-5}$.

3.2.2. Example 2: Aircraft data

We have explored the Saviotti aircraft data (Saviotti, 1996) which was also analyzed by Székely and Rizzo (2009). We consider the wing span (m) vs. speed (km/h) ($n = 230$, Bowman and Azzalini (1997)). Figure 6 shows the scatter plot of the two variables, alongside non-parametric density estimate contours (log scale). It is clear from the plot that there is a non-linear relationship (Pearson's product moment correlation is a modest 0.0168, p-value= 0.8001), although the relationship is complicated and apparently not monotone.



Fig. 6: *Showing the scatter plot and the density estimate contours for the aircraft speed and wing span*

All of the methods described here were significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. The p-values for dCor, MIC, and HHG were 0.00013, 0.00004, and $< 10^{-5}$, respectively. For RankCover the test was also significant with a $p = 0.0008$, and for the hybrid method $p = 0.0002$.

3.2.3. Example 3: ENSO data

The ENSO data (also taken from the NIST Statistical Reference Datasets for non-linear regression) consists of monthly average atmospheric pressure differences between Easter Island and Darwin, Australia (Kahaner, Moler, Nash, and Forsythe, 1989), with 168 observations. There are 168 observations.The data form a time series, and has different cyclical components which were modeled (NIST StRD for non-linear regression) by the proposed model

$$y = \beta_1 + \beta_2 cos(\tfrac{2\pi x}{12}) + \beta_3 sin(\tfrac{2\pi x}{12}) + \beta_5 cos(\tfrac{2\pi x}{\beta_4}) + \beta_6 sin(\tfrac{2\pi x}{\beta_4}) + \beta_8 cos(\tfrac{2\pi x}{\beta_7}) + \beta_9 sin(\tfrac{2\pi x}{\beta_7}) + \epsilon,$$

where $\beta_1, \beta_2, ..., \beta_9 \in \mathbb{R}$ and ϵ is random Gaussian noise.



Fig. 7: *Showing the scatter plot and the fitted curve for the ENSO dataset*

Figure 7 shows the scatter plot of the data along with the fitted curve. The cyclical fluctuations are evident, but no linear trend is observed. Thus, the Pearsonian correlation (0.0843) fails to capture the pattern. However a simple serial correlation with lag 1 (0.6102) reveals the association. With 100,000 simulations, the RankCover test is significant with p-value 0.00032. The hybrid test and MIC test are also significant with p-values 0.00064 and 0.00027 respectively. However dCor and HHG fail to detect significant association (p-values 0.13521 and 0.07617, respectively).

3.2.4. Example 4: Yeast data

In this example, we analyze a yeast cell cycle gene expression dataset with 6223 genes Spellman et al. (1998). The experiment was designed to identify genes with activity varying throughout the cell cycle (Spellman, Sherlock, Zhang, Iyer, Anders, Eisen, Brown, Botstein, and Futcher, 1998), and thus transcript levels would be expected to oscillate. This data has been analyzed by many researchers, including Reshef, Reshef, Finucane, Grossman, McVean, Turnbaugh, Lander, Mitzenmacher, and Sabeti (2011), who used it to verifying the ability of MIC to detect oscillating patterns. We have run dCor, MIC, HHG, RankCover and the hybrid methods of test on the data and used the Benjamini-Hochberg method to control the false discovery rate.

We have listed the genes identified by different methods after controlling the false discovery rate (FDR) at the 5% level and compared them with the list of genes identified by Spellman, Sherlock, Zhang, Iyer, Anders, Eisen, Brown, Botstein, and Futcher (1998). Of

all the genes identified by Spellman et al. (1998), RankCover found 16% to be significant, while dCor, MIC and HHG found only 6%, 2% and 8% respectively. The hybrid method could identify 12% of those genes. Instead controlling the FDR at 25%, the figures for HHG, dCor, MIC, RankCover and the hybrid method become 39%, 23%, 18%, 57% and 47% respectively. These figures differ slightly from those reported in Reshef et al. (2011), due to the difference in the procedure of handling the missing data (See Supplementary Article for details).

For these data, RankCover is clearly successful at identifying oscillating patterns expected for the experiment. This is also clear from Figure 8 (panel A, B and C) which compares the FDR adjusted q-values of our RankCover test with those of dCor, MIC and HHG on a logarithmic scale. Most of the genes in Spellman's list which are identified by dCor, MIC or HHG are also identified by RankCover, but RankCover identified more genes than the other methods. Figure 8 (panels D-I) shows some of the genes that are found significant by RankCover at 5% level, but not found significant by at least one of the other three methods. *PDR5* was found significant by MIC, HHG and RankCover, but not by dCor. On the other hand MIC could not identify *FET3*, which was identified by dCor, HHG and RankCover. The other four genes shown in Figure 8 are found significant by RankCover but not by dCor, MIC or HHG. Note that all the six genes are found to be significant by the hybrid method.

4. Summary

Our RankCover testing procedure serves as a simple and powerful method to test for general association between a pair of variables. The method is applicable to the problem of testing general association irrespective of the marginal distributions of the (continuous) variables. Use of the rank scale also allows a pre-computed null distribution for the statistic, avoiding the need for actual permutation. This, along with the introduction of the idea of using a single disk size makes the procedure computationally feasible. The testing procedure has been shown to be powerful in simulated datasets even with a small sample size. A variety of real datasets, ranging from studies of cell cycle effects in gene expression to studies involving circular interference transmittance show that the approach provides useful and interpretable results.

Although dCor is theoretically motivated by consideration of characteristic functions, in practice it suffers for non-monotone relationships. Our RankCover procedure is generally powerful and robust, and is more powerful than MIC, dCor and HHG for a number of



Fig. 8: ***A.*** *The plot comparing the FDR adjusted q-values of the test using RankCover and that using dCor for the genes in Spellman's list in a log scale. It is evident that most of the genes in Spellman's list have a smaller q-value when RankCover test is used.* ***B.*** *A similar plot comparing the q-values of RankCover and MIC.* ***C.*** *A similar plot comparing the q-values of RankCover and HHG.* ***D-I.*** *Examples of genes in the Spellman's list that were identified by RankCover, but not by at least one of dCor, MIC or HHG. The values in parentheses are the Spellman scores for the genes.*

scenarios. RankCover may be especially useful to detect oscillating relationships, keeping in mind that such relationships need not be periodic and the amplitudes may vary. A hybrid of RankCover and dCor is proposed, which is shown to be highly robust against many forms of associations.

With the rapid rise of large datasets in today's scientific community, RankCover provides a useful tool to detect general association. The approach is both sensitive and relatively powerful, even with small samples, against various and general forms of association.

References

Albert, P. S., D. Ratnasinghe, J. Tangrea, and S. Wacholder (2001). Limitations of the case-only design for identifying gene-environment interactions. *American Journal of Epidemiology 154*(8), 687–693.

Bowman, A. W. and A. Azzalini (1997). *Applied Smoothing Techniques for Data Analysis: The Kernel Approach with S-Plus Illustrations: The Kernel Approach with S-Plus Illustrations*. Oxford University Press.

Clark, P. J. and F. C. Evans (1954). Distance to nearest neighbor as a measure of spatial relationships in populations. *Ecology*, 445–453.

Cuzick, J. (1985). A wilcoxon-type test for trend. *Statistics in medicine 4*(4), 543–547.

de Siqueira Santos, S., D. Y. Takahashi, A. Nakata, and A. Fujita (2013). A comparative study of statistical methods used to identify dependencies between gene expression signals. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, bbt051.

Diggle, P. J. (1983). *Statistical analysis of spatial point patterns*. Academic Press London.

Eckerle, K. (1979). Circular interference transmittance study. *National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), US Department of Commerce, USA*.

Hamed, K. H. and A. Ramachandra Rao (1998). A modified mann-kendall trend test for autocorrelated data. *Journal of Hydrology 204*(1), 182–196.

Heller, R., Y. Heller, and M. Gorfine (2013). A consistent multivariate test of association based on ranks of distances. *Biometrika 100*(2), 503–510.

Holgate, P. (1965a). Some new tests of randomness. *The Journal of Ecology*, 261–266.

Holgate, P. (1965b). Tests of randomness based on distance methods. *Biometrika 52*(3-4), 345–353.

Kahaner, D., C. B. Moler, S. Nash, and G. E. Forsythe (1989). *Numerical methods and software*. Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Kendall, M. (1975). *Rank correlation methods*. Griffin, London.

Mann, H. B. (1945). Non-parametric test against trend. *Econometrika 13*, 245–259.

Puri, M. L. and P. K. Sen (1971). Nonparametric methods in multivariate analysis.

Reshef, D. N., Y. A. Reshef, H. K. Finucane, S. R. Grossman, G. McVean, P. J. Turnbaugh, E. S. Lander, M. Mitzenmacher, and P. C. Sabeti (2011). Detecting novel associations in large data sets. *Science 334*(6062), 1518–1524.

Ripley, B. (1979). Tests of 'randomness' for spatial point patterns. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 368–374.

Saviotti, P. (1996). *Technological evolution, variety, and the economy.* E. Elgar.

Simon, N. and R. Tibshirani (2014). Comment on "detecting novel associations in large data sets" by reshef et al, science dec 16, 2011. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.7645*.

Smith, T. E. (2004). A scale-sensitive test of attraction and repulsion between spatial point patterns. *Geographical analysis 36*(4), 315–331.

Spellman, P. T., G. Sherlock, M. Q. Zhang, V. R. Iyer, K. Anders, M. B. Eisen, P. O. Brown, D. Botstein, and B. Futcher (1998). Comprehensive identification of cell cycle–regulated genes of the yeast saccharomyces cerevisiae by microarray hybridization. *Molecular biology of the cell 9*(12), 3273–3297.

Székely, G. J. and M. L. Rizzo (2009). Brownian distance covariance. *The annals of applied statistics 3*(4), 1236–1265.

Székely, G. J., M. L. Rizzo, and N. K. Bakirov (2007). Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances. *The Annals of Statistics 35*(6), 2769–2794.

Wilks, S. (1935). On the independence of k sets of normally distributed statistical variables. *Econometrica, Journal of the Econometric Society*, 309–326.

arXiv:1409.8198v1 [stat.ME] 29 Sep 2014

Supplementary Article for
A procedure to detect general association based on concentration of ranks

Pratyaydipta Rudra

Department of Biostatistics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Fred A. Wright

North Carolina State University Bioinformatics Research Center

S1. Details of the testing procedure

Let (x_k, y_k) denote the ranks of the kth sample pair, $k = 1, 2, ..., n$. We define

$d(i, j, x_k, y_k)$ = Distance between the point (i, j) on the grid and (x_k, y_k); $d_{ij} = \min_k d(i, j, x_k, y_k)$.

The RankCover method measures the concentration of ranks using the test statistic

$$T(\delta) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1-\lceil\delta\rceil}^{n+\lceil\delta\rceil} \sum_{j=1-\lceil\delta\rceil}^{n+\lceil\delta\rceil} I(d_{ij} \leq \delta), \tag{1}$$

where δ is the disc radius (for Manhattan distance, δ is half the diagonal of each square). $\lceil t\rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to t.



Fig. S1: *Figure showing the grid used to calculate RankCover statistic:* $n = 20$, $\lceil\delta_{opt}\rceil = 6$, *all the points on the grid are used to calculate the statistic rather than using just the points in the inner square*

An $(n+2\lceil\delta\rceil)\times(n+2\lceil\delta\rceil)$ grid is considered which is an outward extension of the $n\times n$ grid $\{1,2,...,n\}\times\{1,2,...,n\}$ (Figure S1).

In order to do the test, one can pre-compute the threshold based on a large number of simulations. The use of ranks enables such pre-computation as the distribution of our test statistic under null doesn't depend on the distributions of x and y. In Section S10, we have presented a table of such pre-computed thresholds for some sample sizes.

S2. Choice of the disk size

The choice of the disc size δ is an important consideration. We have proposed the use of a single optimum choice of δ as opposed to the whole δ versus $F(\delta)$ curve used by Diggle. The argument for choosing $\delta_{opt}=\sqrt{n}$ for Euclidean distance and $\delta=\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{n}$ is somewhat heuristic, but based on empirical observations for several sample sizes.



Fig. S2: *Showing the mean and sd of $T(\delta)$ for sample sizes 50 and 100 (Euclidean distance is used)*

To understand the idea, we examine the expectation and standard deviation of $T(\delta)$ under null for varying δ. These curves calculated based on 1000 simulations under null are shown in Figure S2 for Euclidean distance and Figure S3 for Manhattan distance. There is a clear change of curvature in the expectation in the vicinity of $\delta=\sqrt{n}$, and also we note that the standard deviation exhibits a local maximum and minimum in the vicinity. We reason that the local minimum of the standard deviation represents a good choice for δ. We also



Fig. S3: *Showing the mean and sd of $T(\delta)$ for sample sizes 50 and 100 (Manhattan distance is used)*

note that the point where the expectation curve changes the curvature is approximately the same point as the local minimum of the standard deviation. However, there is no closed form expression for this point of local minimum. From simulations under different sample sizes, we have established that such local minima occur near $\delta = \sqrt{n}$ for Euclidian distance, and propose it as our choice of δ_{opt}. Also, it is clear from these simulations that if the distance metric is symmetric (eg Euclidian, Manhattan etc), the shape of these curves depend on δ only through the area of the disk, and so we use $\delta_{opt} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}n}$ for the Manhattan distance.

S3. A single δ_{opt} vs. the entire curve

Figure S4 shows an illustrative power comparison of our approach using a single optimum value of δ and the approach using the whole δ versus $F(\delta)$ curve. The second approach uses the area under curve as the test statistic. We have demonstrated the power comparisons for three different types of relationships: linear, quadratic and circular. It is clear from Figure S4 that the use of a single δ doesn't reduce power substantially, but greatly reduces computation time.



Fig. S4: *Showing the power comparison of RankCover using δ_{opt} and the Area Under Curve method for three different types of relationship*

S4. Details of the analysis of simulated data

This section explains the details of the analysis of simulated data in Section 3.1. We have used Manhattan distance throughout all the analyses due to the ease of tail area computation (Section S10). RankCover procedure with Manhattan distance appears to give similar results to that with Euclidean distance (See Section S5).

The sample size is 50 (for other sample sizes see Section S7) and we used 1000 simulations under the null for RankCover and MIC. For dCor and HHG, 1000 permutations are used. The power curves are obtained based on 500 simulations. The independent variable x is simulated as $U(0,1)$. The dependent variable y is calculated using the equation

$$y = f(x) + \nu \times error, \tag{2}$$

where ν is the noise scale parameter and increases from 0.1 to 1 as in Figure 4. The error distribution was chosen to be normal. However, as in Simon and Tibshirani (2014), the variance of the error distribution was considered differently for different forms of relationship. Section S8 shows how the results are similar with other distributions also. The details of the forms of the function $f(.)$ and the error distributions are as below.

- Linear: $f(x) = x$, error distribution is $N(0,1)$
- Quadratic: $f(x) = 4(x - 1/2)^2$, error distribution is $N(0,1)$
- Cubic: $f(x) = 128(x - 1/3)^3 - 48(x - 1/3)^2 - 12(x - 1/3)$, error distribution is $N(0,100)$
- Sine: $f(x) = sin(4\pi x)$, error distribution is $N(0,4)$

- $X^{1/4}$: $f(x) = x^{1/4}$, error distribution is $N(0, 1)$
- Circle: $f(x) = (2r-1)\sqrt{1-(2x-1)^2}$, error distribution is $N(0, 1/16)$, where r is a Bernoulli$(1/2)$ variable
- Two curves: $f(x) = 2rx + (1-r)\sqrt{x}/2$, error distribution is $N(0, 1/4)$, where r is a Bernoulli$(1/2)$ variable
- X-function: $f(x) = rx + (1-r)(1-x)$, error distribution is $N(0, 1/25)$, where r is a Bernoulli$(1/2)$ variable
- Diamond: $f(x) = r_1 I(x < 0.5) + r_2 I(x \geq 0.5)$, error distribution is $N(0, 1/100)$, where r_1 is a $U(0.5-x, 0.5+x)$ variable and r_2 is a $U(x-0.5, 1.5-x)$ variable



Fig. S5: *Showing the power of different methods for Euclidean distance,* $n = 50$

S5. Choice of distance metric

We have explored two distance metrics: Euclidean distance and Manhattan distance. The performance of RankCover does not vary much based on the choice of the distance metric. Figure S5 shows the power analysis on simulated data using Euclidean distance. The results are not much different from those obtained using Manhattan distance (Figure 4). However, we recommend Manhattan distance since it has the advantage of more easily approximating the tail area (Section S10).



Fig. S6: *Showing the power comparison of dCor and Spearman's rank correlation*

S6. Comparison of dCor with Spearman's rank correlation

The only cases where RankCover is dominated by some other method are all monotone relationships (linear, $X^{1/4}$, Two curves) and in all those cases dCor appears to be the best choice. However, we have shown (Figure S6) that even Spearman's rank correlation is

equally powerful in those cases. Therefore, if we have prior knowledge that the relationship is monotone, then we do not gain anything by using the fancier methods anyway, and could use Spearman's rank correlation instead. We note that Spearman's rank correlation does not have much "generality" in the sense that it is not powerful against non-monotone alternatives. However, dCor has also been shown to have similar limitations.

S7. Simulation results for some other sample sizes

Figure S7 and Figure S8 show simulation results based on sample sizes 25 and 100 respectively. As an augment to Figure 4, the usefulness of RankCover is reflected in these figures.



Fig. S7: *Showing the power of different methods for $n = 25$ (Manhattan distance)*



Fig. S8: *Showing the power of different methods for* $n = 100$ *(Manhattan distance)*

S8. Simulation results for different marginal distributions of x and y

We have carried out the simulation analysis for different marginal distributions of x and different error distributions. Three distributions of different shapes are used for the marginal distribution of X: uniform, truncated normal (a normal distribution with mean 1/2 and variance 1/12 truncated between 0 and 1)and a U-shaped beta (beta$(1/2, 1/2)$). The choices for the error distributions are normal, U(0,1) and beta$(1/2, 1/2)$ with appropriate shift of origin and scale so that the mean and variance of the error distributions are 0 and 1 respectively.

The results of these nine cases show that RankCover has reasonable power in all these cases. It has very high power in some cases (Figure S9) and the power is not as high but still competitive in some other cases (Figure S10). Table S1 shows a summary of all the cases. The mean power over all the noise levels are shown for each case. Since the power

curves rarely cross each other, the mean power (which is approximately proportional to area under the power curve) appears to be a good indicator of performance.

Table S1: ***Showing the mean power of the different methods for the nine cases. For each case, the first word is the distribution of x and the second word is the error distribution. eg. Beta-Normal refers to the case where marginal of x is beta and error distribution is normal***

	Linear	Quadratic	Cubic	Sine	$X^{1/4}$	Circle	2-Curves	X-function	Diamond
Beta-Beta									
dCor	0.90	0.48	0.67	0.47	0.67	0.11	1.00	0.20	0.09
RankCover	0.97	0.94	0.91	0.63	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.84
Hybrid	0.95	0.90	0.87	0.56	0.79	1.00	1.00	0.93	0.76
MIC	0.88	0.50	0.55	0.43	0.69	0.71	0.96	0.50	0.14
HHG	0.94	0.72	0.74	0.47	0.77	0.97	1.00	0.89	0.76
Beta-Normal									
dCor	0.90	0.52	0.69	0.51	0.69	0.10	1.00	0.19	0.09
RankCover	0.75	0.72	0.75	0.48	0.54	1.00	0.97	0.94	0.81
Hybrid	0.86	0.67	0.74	0.49	0.62	1.00	0.99	0.91	0.74
MIC	0.70	0.61	0.61	0.51	0.46	0.73	0.93	0.51	0.15
HHG	0.81	0.65	0.70	0.46	0.59	0.98	0.99	0.89	0.77
Beta-Uniform									
dCor	0.89	0.49	0.67	0.46	0.66	0.11	1.00	0.20	0.09
RankCover	0.85	0.80	0.81	0.50	0.63	1.00	0.99	0.94	0.83
Hybrid	0.86	0.74	0.77	0.47	0.62	1.00	0.99	0.91	0.75
MIC	0.74	0.51	0.56	0.44	0.47	0.71	0.93	0.50	0.15
HHG	0.82	0.62	0.69	0.41	0.60	0.97	0.99	0.88	0.76
Normal-Beta									
dCor	0.71	0.42	0.38	0.34	0.40	0.05	0.94	0.46	0.05
RankCover	0.86	0.76	0.68	0.81	0.58	0.87	0.90	0.89	0.63
Hybrid	0.81	0.68	0.59	0.72	0.51	0.82	0.90	0.84	0.49
MIC	0.69	0.32	0.44	0.47	0.42	0.33	0.73	0.33	0.08
HHG	0.77	0.64	0.55	0.50	0.49	0.57	0.90	0.92	0.64
Normal-Normal									
dCor	0.73	0.44	0.40	0.35	0.42	0.05	0.94	0.47	0.04
RankCover	0.56	0.50	0.41	0.61	0.30	0.85	0.85	0.88	0.63
Hybrid	0.65	0.45	0.40	0.55	0.36	0.79	0.88	0.84	0.50
MIC	0.48	0.38	0.37	0.58	0.25	0.33	0.69	0.35	0.08
HHG	0.58	0.53	0.43	0.48	0.32	0.57	0.89	0.93	0.63
Normal-Uniform									
dCor	0.70	0.41	0.37	0.34	0.40	0.06	0.93	0.47	0.05
RankCover	0.65	0.57	0.49	0.69	0.36	0.84	0.85	0.87	0.62
Hybrid	0.65	0.50	0.44	0.60	0.36	0.78	0.87	0.83	0.50
MIC	0.50	0.33	0.35	0.50	0.26	0.33	0.67	0.33	0.08
HHG	0.59	0.53	0.42	0.45	0.33	0.55	0.88	0.91	0.63
Uniform-Beta									
dCor	0.82	0.47	0.32	0.44	0.51	0.06	0.98	0.32	0.07
RankCover	0.93	0.88	0.74	0.76	0.71	0.98	0.98	0.94	0.77
Hybrid	0.90	0.81	0.65	0.67	0.64	0.97	0.97	0.91	0.68
MIC	0.79	0.42	0.38	0.46	0.55	0.50	0.87	0.42	0.10
HHG	0.87	0.68	0.52	0.48	0.61	0.78	0.97	0.93	0.73
Uniform-Normal									
dCor	0.81	0.46	0.27	0.43	0.51	0.12	0.97	0.26	0.04
RankCover	0.66	0.62	0.51	0.59	0.39	0.98	0.94	0.93	0.78
Hybrid	0.76	0.57	0.45	0.54	0.46	0.96	0.96	0.90	0.68
MIC	0.59	0.51	0.42	0.58	0.33	0.50	0.82	0.44	0.09
HHG	0.71	0.60	0.44	0.46	0.43	0.80	0.96	0.94	0.76

continued to next page...

	Linear	Quadratic	Cubic	Sine	$X^{1/4}$	Circle	2-Curves	X-function	Diamond
					Uniform-Uniform				
dCor	0.80	0.46	0.32	0.44	0.50	0.07	0.98	0.33	0.06
RankCover	0.75	0.70	0.57	0.64	0.47	0.97	0.95	0.92	0.78
Hybrid	0.76	0.63	0.50	0.58	0.46	0.95	0.96	0.89	0.68
MIC	0.61	0.43	0.36	0.48	0.35	0.49	0.82	0.42	0.10
HHG	0.71	0.59	0.43	0.44	0.43	0.76	0.96	0.92	0.74



Fig. S9: *Showing the power of different methods when marginal of x is beta and error distribution is beta ($n = 50$)*

S9. Details of real data analyses

S9.1. Example 1: Eckerle4 data

100,000 simulations were used for RankCover and MIC. 100,000 permutations were used for dCor and HHG. The estimates of $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ obtained from NIST website are used for plotting the fitted curve in Figure 5. Source of data: NIST StRD for non-linear regression.



Fig. S10: *Showing the power of different methods when marginal of x is normal and error distribution is normal ($n = 50$))*

S9.2. Example 2: Aircraft data

100,000 simulations were used for RankCover and MIC. 100,000 permutations were used for dCor and HHG. Source of data: `sm` Package in R (Bowman and Azzalini, 2013).

S9.3. Example 3: ENSO data

100,000 simulations were used for RankCover and MIC. 100,000 permutations were used for dCor and HHG. The estimates of $\beta_1, \beta_2, ..., \beta_9$ obtained from NIST website are used for plotting the fitted curve in Figure 7. Source of data: NIST StRD for non-linear regression.

S9.4. Example 4: Yeast data

100,000 simulations were used for RankCover and MIC. 100,000 permutations were used for dCor and HHG. The data was pre-processed before analysis as follows. The data contained several missing observations. Since the sample size is small (24), we removed all the genes that had more than 3 missing observations. All other missing observations were imputed using KNN imputation (Troyanskaya, Cantor, Sherlock, Brown, Hastie, Tibshirani, Botstein, and Altman, 2001). Then quantile normalization was used to normalize the data. Unlike Reshef, Reshef, Finucane, Grossman, McVean, Turnbaugh, Lander, Mitzenmacher, and Sabeti (2011), we didn't remove any of the time points and didn't use any interpolation to find expression values for intermediate timepoints. Source of data: Comprehensive Identification of Cell Cycle regulated Genes of the Yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae by Microarray Hybridization.

S10. Tables of pre-computed thresholds

The use of ranks in our procedure enables us to build tables of pre-computed thresholds for the test. Such pre-computed thresholds for RankCover method with Manhattan distance are given in Table S2 and those for the hybrid method are given in Table S3. 100000 simulations were used to calculate the thresholds in each case. For the Manhattan metric, the rejection thresholds follow a sawtooth pattern (Figure S11), with jump points occurring at the values of n where $[\delta]$ changes. Simulations were performed for $n = 20, ..., 100$. For large values of n, to reduce computation, tables were generated by (1) performing direct simulation for the values of n at, and just prior to, the jump points, followed by (2) linear interpolation for remaining values of n.



Fig. S11: *Showing the 5th percentiles of the Rankcover statistic for Manhattan distance for* $n = 50, ..., 500$. *Similar pattern is observed for other percentiles also.*

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
20	1.31000	1.28500	1.26000	1.23250	1.16500	1.10500
21	1.27211	1.24717	1.22449	1.19501	1.12925	1.07936
22	1.23554	1.21281	1.19215	1.16529	1.10331	1.06405
23	1.39698	1.37240	1.35161	1.32325	1.26087	1.20227
24	1.36111	1.33854	1.31771	1.29167	1.23090	1.16493
25	1.32960	1.30720	1.28640	1.26240	1.20640	1.14720
26	1.30030	1.27959	1.25888	1.23373	1.17899	1.12574
27	1.27298	1.25240	1.23320	1.20850	1.15501	1.10151
28	1.24745	1.22832	1.20918	1.18622	1.13520	1.08291
29	1.22473	1.20452	1.18668	1.16290	1.11415	1.07134
30	1.20222	1.18333	1.16444	1.14222	1.09222	1.04889
31	1.18106	1.16233	1.14464	1.12279	1.07700	1.03018
32	1.30469	1.28613	1.26855	1.24609	1.19922	1.15625
33	1.28375	1.26538	1.24885	1.22865	1.18182	1.14509
34	1.26384	1.24567	1.22924	1.20934	1.16263	1.11938
35	1.24490	1.22776	1.21061	1.19102	1.14286	1.10286
36	1.22685	1.20988	1.19367	1.17361	1.13040	1.09259
37	1.21110	1.19430	1.17823	1.15997	1.11395	1.08400
38	1.19453	1.17798	1.16274	1.14474	1.10319	1.06856
39	1.17883	1.16239	1.14727	1.12821	1.08613	1.05523
40	1.16375	1.14813	1.13375	1.11563	1.07437	1.04375
41	1.26413	1.24866	1.23379	1.21594	1.17668	1.14456
42	1.24943	1.23413	1.21995	1.20181	1.16213	1.12132
43	1.23580	1.22012	1.20606	1.18875	1.15035	1.10871
44	1.22159	1.20713	1.19318	1.17717	1.13998	1.10795
45	1.20889	1.19407	1.18074	1.16395	1.12444	1.09284
46	1.19660	1.18195	1.16824	1.15217	1.11531	1.08932
47	1.18470	1.17021	1.15708	1.14079	1.10457	1.07062
48	1.17231	1.15842	1.14497	1.12934	1.09115	1.06510
49	1.16160	1.14744	1.13369	1.11828	1.08330	1.05373
50	1.15080	1.13640	1.12400	1.10760	1.07360	1.04520
51	1.13995	1.12611	1.11342	1.09765	1.06267	1.03114
52	1.22337	1.20969	1.19749	1.18158	1.14756	1.11501
53	1.21289	1.19972	1.18726	1.17230	1.13884	1.11463
54	1.20302	1.18964	1.17764	1.16324	1.12929	1.10391
55	1.19273	1.17983	1.16793	1.15372	1.12066	1.09421
56	1.18367	1.17060	1.15912	1.14445	1.11129	1.07175
57	1.17421	1.16159	1.15020	1.13573	1.10249	1.07572
58	1.16498	1.15250	1.14090	1.12634	1.09304	1.06421
59	1.15628	1.14392	1.13243	1.11807	1.08475	1.05918
60	1.14778	1.13528	1.12361	1.11000	1.07805	1.05333
61	1.13948	1.12739	1.11610	1.10266	1.06987	1.04139
62	1.13137	1.11889	1.10744	1.09417	1.06322	1.03668
63	1.12371	1.11111	1.10028	1.08743	1.05694	1.03452
64	1.19434	1.18237	1.17188	1.15845	1.12524	1.10181
65	1.18627	1.17467	1.16426	1.15101	1.12260	1.09870
66	1.17906	1.16736	1.15657	1.14371	1.11524	1.08655
67	1.17153	1.15995	1.14970	1.13678	1.11049	1.08599
68	1.16436	1.15268	1.14208	1.12954	1.10208	1.07656
69	1.15690	1.14556	1.13506	1.12329	1.09494	1.07498
70	1.15041	1.13898	1.12878	1.11612	1.08898	1.06510
71	1.14323	1.13212	1.12200	1.10930	1.08173	1.05237
72	1.13657	1.12558	1.11555	1.10359	1.07485	1.05112
73	1.12986	1.11878	1.10884	1.09758	1.06943	1.04447
74	1.12381	1.11304	1.10299	1.09112	1.06410	1.03853
75	1.11769	1.10702	1.09707	1.08533	1.05778	1.04000
76	1.11165	1.10059	1.09107	1.07877	1.05315	1.03116

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
77	1.10525	1.09462	1.08501	1.07320	1.04638	1.02749
78	1.16650	1.15631	1.14678	1.13560	1.11012	1.08695
79	1.16055	1.15014	1.14084	1.12931	1.10383	1.08348
80	1.15453	1.14437	1.13484	1.12344	1.09922	1.07344
81	1.14906	1.13900	1.12986	1.11888	1.09282	1.07194
82	1.14307	1.13311	1.12433	1.11288	1.08864	1.06856
83	1.13805	1.12818	1.11932	1.10814	1.08434	1.06474
84	1.13265	1.12259	1.11338	1.10247	1.07851	1.05782
85	1.12720	1.11696	1.10754	1.09689	1.07170	1.05190
86	1.12196	1.11195	1.10289	1.09248	1.06963	1.04070
87	1.11692	1.10715	1.09856	1.08733	1.06223	1.04082
88	1.11170	1.10176	1.09310	1.08226	1.05850	1.03719
89	1.10668	1.09670	1.08787	1.07650	1.05328	1.03055
90	1.10198	1.09235	1.08346	1.07284	1.04901	1.02914
91	1.09733	1.08767	1.07910	1.06883	1.04516	1.02210
92	1.15064	1.14130	1.13268	1.12228	1.09983	1.07999
93	1.14591	1.13666	1.12880	1.11840	1.09481	1.07619
94	1.14113	1.13207	1.12381	1.11374	1.09110	1.07209
95	1.13651	1.12720	1.11889	1.10903	1.08632	1.06825
96	1.13184	1.12250	1.11404	1.10406	1.08203	1.06272
97	1.12754	1.11829	1.11021	1.09980	1.07716	1.05707
98	1.12349	1.11454	1.10641	1.09652	1.07434	1.05269
99	1.11887	1.10978	1.10183	1.09193	1.07091	1.05387
100	1.11470	1.10580	1.09740	1.08760	1.06480	1.04480
101	1.11229	1.10332	1.09536	1.08528	1.06346	1.04473
102	1.10803	1.09910	1.09122	1.08117	1.05942	1.04081
103	1.10377	1.09488	1.08707	1.07706	1.05538	1.03689
104	1.09951	1.09066	1.08292	1.07295	1.05134	1.03298
105	1.09525	1.08644	1.07878	1.06884	1.04730	1.02906
106	1.09099	1.08222	1.07463	1.06473	1.04326	1.02514
107	1.08673	1.07800	1.07048	1.06062	1.03922	1.02122
108	1.13400	1.12543	1.11806	1.10897	1.08813	1.07073
109	1.13053	1.12200	1.11464	1.10560	1.08484	1.06766
110	1.12706	1.11857	1.11123	1.10223	1.08154	1.06459
111	1.12358	1.11514	1.10782	1.09886	1.07824	1.06152
112	1.12011	1.11171	1.10441	1.09550	1.07495	1.05845
113	1.11664	1.10828	1.10100	1.09213	1.07165	1.05537
114	1.11316	1.10485	1.09759	1.08876	1.06835	1.05230
115	1.10969	1.10143	1.09418	1.08539	1.06505	1.04923
116	1.10622	1.09800	1.09077	1.08203	1.06176	1.04616
117	1.10274	1.09457	1.08735	1.07866	1.05846	1.04309
118	1.09927	1.09114	1.08394	1.07529	1.05516	1.04002
119	1.09580	1.08771	1.08053	1.07192	1.05187	1.03695
120	1.09233	1.08428	1.07712	1.06856	1.04857	1.03388
121	1.08885	1.08085	1.07371	1.06519	1.04527	1.03081
122	1.08538	1.07742	1.07030	1.06182	1.04197	1.02773
123	1.08191	1.07399	1.06689	1.05845	1.03868	1.02466
124	1.07843	1.07056	1.06348	1.05509	1.03538	1.02159
125	1.12051	1.11296	1.10630	1.09811	1.07776	1.05946
126	1.11767	1.11013	1.10349	1.09531	1.07514	1.05713
127	1.11482	1.10731	1.10068	1.09251	1.07252	1.05480
128	1.11198	1.10448	1.09786	1.08971	1.06990	1.05247
129	1.10913	1.10166	1.09505	1.08690	1.06728	1.05014
130	1.10628	1.09883	1.09223	1.08410	1.06466	1.04782
131	1.10344	1.09601	1.08942	1.08130	1.06204	1.04549
132	1.10059	1.09318	1.08661	1.07850	1.05942	1.04316
133	1.09775	1.09036	1.08379	1.07570	1.05681	1.04083

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
134	1.09490	1.08753	1.08098	1.07290	1.05419	1.03851
135	1.09206	1.08471	1.07816	1.07009	1.05157	1.03618
136	1.08921	1.08188	1.07535	1.06729	1.04895	1.03385
137	1.08637	1.07906	1.07254	1.06449	1.04633	1.03152
138	1.08352	1.07623	1.06972	1.06169	1.04371	1.02919
139	1.08068	1.07341	1.06691	1.05889	1.04109	1.02687
140	1.07783	1.07058	1.06409	1.05608	1.03847	1.02454
141	1.07499	1.06776	1.06128	1.05328	1.03585	1.02221
142	1.07214	1.06493	1.05846	1.05048	1.03323	1.01988
143	1.06929	1.06211	1.05565	1.04768	1.03061	1.01756
144	1.10745	1.10050	1.09418	1.08656	1.06964	1.05314
145	1.10505	1.09812	1.09183	1.08422	1.06736	1.05108
146	1.10266	1.09574	1.08948	1.08188	1.06508	1.04901
147	1.10026	1.09336	1.08712	1.07954	1.06281	1.04694
148	1.09787	1.09098	1.08477	1.07720	1.06053	1.04487
149	1.09548	1.08860	1.08242	1.07486	1.05825	1.04281
150	1.09308	1.08622	1.08006	1.07252	1.05598	1.04074
151	1.09069	1.08384	1.07771	1.07018	1.05370	1.03867
152	1.08830	1.08146	1.07536	1.06784	1.05142	1.03660
153	1.08590	1.07908	1.07300	1.06550	1.04915	1.03454
154	1.08351	1.07670	1.07065	1.06316	1.04687	1.03247
155	1.08111	1.07432	1.06830	1.06081	1.04459	1.03040
156	1.07872	1.07193	1.06594	1.05847	1.04232	1.02833
157	1.07633	1.06955	1.06359	1.05613	1.04004	1.02627
158	1.07393	1.06717	1.06123	1.05379	1.03776	1.02420
159	1.07154	1.06479	1.05888	1.05145	1.03548	1.02213
160	1.06915	1.06241	1.05653	1.04911	1.03321	1.02006
161	1.06675	1.06003	1.05417	1.04677	1.03093	1.01800
162	1.06436	1.05765	1.05182	1.04443	1.02865	1.01593
163	1.09895	1.09248	1.08657	1.07949	1.06421	1.05123
164	1.09692	1.09046	1.08456	1.07749	1.06225	1.04937
165	1.09488	1.08844	1.08255	1.07549	1.06030	1.04752
166	1.09285	1.08643	1.08054	1.07349	1.05834	1.04566
167	1.09081	1.08441	1.07853	1.07149	1.05638	1.04381
168	1.08878	1.08239	1.07652	1.06949	1.05443	1.04196
169	1.08674	1.08037	1.07451	1.06749	1.05247	1.04010
170	1.08471	1.07836	1.07250	1.06549	1.05052	1.03825
171	1.08267	1.07634	1.07049	1.06348	1.04856	1.03640
172	1.08064	1.07432	1.06848	1.06148	1.04660	1.03454
173	1.07860	1.07231	1.06647	1.05948	1.04465	1.03269
174	1.07657	1.07029	1.06446	1.05748	1.04269	1.03084
175	1.07453	1.06827	1.06245	1.05548	1.04073	1.02898
176	1.07250	1.06626	1.06044	1.05348	1.03878	1.02713
177	1.07047	1.06424	1.05843	1.05148	1.03682	1.02528
178	1.06843	1.06222	1.05642	1.04948	1.03486	1.02342
179	1.06640	1.06020	1.05441	1.04748	1.03291	1.02157
180	1.06436	1.05819	1.05240	1.04548	1.03095	1.01971
181	1.06233	1.05617	1.05039	1.04348	1.02900	1.01786
182	1.06029	1.05415	1.04838	1.04148	1.02704	1.01601
183	1.05826	1.05214	1.04637	1.03948	1.02508	1.01415
184	1.08994	1.08388	1.07872	1.07242	1.05801	1.04182
185	1.08820	1.08216	1.07699	1.07071	1.05634	1.04025
186	1.08647	1.08044	1.07526	1.06899	1.05468	1.03868
187	1.08473	1.07872	1.07353	1.06728	1.05301	1.03711
188	1.08300	1.07700	1.07181	1.06556	1.05134	1.03554
189	1.08126	1.07527	1.07008	1.06384	1.04968	1.03397
190	1.07952	1.07355	1.06835	1.06213	1.04801	1.03240

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
191	1.07779	1.07183	1.06663	1.06041	1.04635	1.03083
192	1.07605	1.07011	1.06490	1.05869	1.04468	1.02926
193	1.07432	1.06839	1.06317	1.05698	1.04301	1.02769
194	1.07258	1.06666	1.06145	1.05526	1.04135	1.02612
195	1.07084	1.06494	1.05972	1.05354	1.03968	1.02455
196	1.06911	1.06322	1.05799	1.05183	1.03801	1.02298
197	1.06737	1.06150	1.05626	1.05011	1.03635	1.02141
198	1.06564	1.05977	1.05454	1.04840	1.03468	1.01984
199	1.06390	1.05805	1.05281	1.04668	1.03301	1.01827
200	1.06216	1.05633	1.05108	1.04496	1.03135	1.01670
201	1.06043	1.05461	1.04936	1.04325	1.02968	1.01513
202	1.05869	1.05289	1.04763	1.04153	1.02802	1.01356
203	1.05696	1.05116	1.04590	1.03981	1.02635	1.01199
204	1.05522	1.04944	1.04417	1.03810	1.02468	1.01042
205	1.05348	1.04772	1.04245	1.03638	1.02302	1.00885
206	1.05175	1.04600	1.04072	1.03466	1.02135	1.00728
207	1.08098	1.07536	1.07029	1.06418	1.05092	1.03650
208	1.07947	1.07385	1.06879	1.06268	1.04946	1.03508
209	1.07795	1.07234	1.06729	1.06119	1.04800	1.03365
210	1.07643	1.07083	1.06579	1.05969	1.04654	1.03223
211	1.07492	1.06932	1.06429	1.05820	1.04508	1.03081
212	1.07340	1.06781	1.06279	1.05670	1.04361	1.02938
213	1.07189	1.06630	1.06129	1.05521	1.04215	1.02796
214	1.07037	1.06479	1.05979	1.05371	1.04069	1.02654
215	1.06886	1.06328	1.05829	1.05222	1.03923	1.02511
216	1.06734	1.06177	1.05679	1.05073	1.03777	1.02369
217	1.06582	1.06026	1.05529	1.04923	1.03631	1.02227
218	1.06431	1.05875	1.05379	1.04774	1.03484	1.02084
219	1.06279	1.05724	1.05229	1.04624	1.03338	1.01942
220	1.06128	1.05573	1.05078	1.04475	1.03192	1.01800
221	1.05976	1.05422	1.04928	1.04325	1.03046	1.01657
222	1.05825	1.05271	1.04778	1.04176	1.02900	1.01515
223	1.05673	1.05120	1.04628	1.04026	1.02753	1.01373
224	1.05521	1.04969	1.04478	1.03877	1.02607	1.01230
225	1.05370	1.04818	1.04328	1.03727	1.02461	1.01088
226	1.05218	1.04667	1.04178	1.03578	1.02315	1.00946
227	1.05067	1.04516	1.04028	1.03428	1.02169	1.00803
228	1.04915	1.04365	1.03878	1.03279	1.02023	1.00661
229	1.04763	1.04214	1.03728	1.03129	1.01876	1.00519
230	1.07488	1.06968	1.06493	1.05941	1.04715	1.03673
231	1.07355	1.06836	1.06362	1.05811	1.04591	1.03557
232	1.07222	1.06704	1.06231	1.05680	1.04466	1.03441
233	1.07090	1.06571	1.06100	1.05550	1.04342	1.03325
234	1.06957	1.06439	1.05969	1.05419	1.04218	1.03210
235	1.06824	1.06307	1.05838	1.05289	1.04094	1.03094
236	1.06691	1.06175	1.05707	1.05158	1.03970	1.02978
237	1.06559	1.06043	1.05576	1.05028	1.03846	1.02862
238	1.06426	1.05911	1.05444	1.04897	1.03722	1.02746
239	1.06293	1.05778	1.05313	1.04767	1.03598	1.02630
240	1.06161	1.05646	1.05182	1.04636	1.03474	1.02515
241	1.06028	1.05514	1.05051	1.04506	1.03350	1.02399
242	1.05895	1.05382	1.04920	1.04375	1.03226	1.02283
243	1.05763	1.05250	1.04789	1.04244	1.03102	1.02167
244	1.05630	1.05118	1.04658	1.04114	1.02978	1.02051
245	1.05497	1.04985	1.04527	1.03983	1.02854	1.01935
246	1.05364	1.04853	1.04395	1.03853	1.02730	1.01820
247	1.05232	1.04721	1.04264	1.03722	1.02606	1.01704

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
248	1.05099	1.04589	1.04133	1.03592	1.02482	1.01588
249	1.04966	1.04457	1.04002	1.03461	1.02358	1.01472
250	1.04834	1.04325	1.03871	1.03331	1.02234	1.01356
251	1.04701	1.04192	1.03740	1.03200	1.02110	1.01240
252	1.04568	1.04060	1.03609	1.03070	1.01986	1.01124
253	1.04436	1.03928	1.03478	1.02939	1.01862	1.01009
254	1.04303	1.03796	1.03346	1.02809	1.01738	1.00893
255	1.06817	1.06341	1.05913	1.05390	1.04269	1.03194
256	1.06702	1.06225	1.05796	1.05274	1.04155	1.03085
257	1.06587	1.06109	1.05680	1.05159	1.04041	1.02975
258	1.06471	1.05993	1.05563	1.05043	1.03926	1.02865
259	1.06356	1.05877	1.05447	1.04927	1.03812	1.02756
260	1.06241	1.05761	1.05330	1.04811	1.03698	1.02646
261	1.06126	1.05645	1.05213	1.04695	1.03583	1.02537
262	1.06010	1.05529	1.05097	1.04580	1.03469	1.02427
263	1.05895	1.05413	1.04980	1.04464	1.03355	1.02318
264	1.05780	1.05297	1.04863	1.04348	1.03241	1.02208
265	1.05664	1.05181	1.04747	1.04232	1.03126	1.02099
266	1.05549	1.05066	1.04630	1.04116	1.03012	1.01989
267	1.05434	1.04950	1.04514	1.04000	1.02898	1.01880
268	1.05319	1.04834	1.04397	1.03885	1.02783	1.01770
269	1.05203	1.04718	1.04280	1.03769	1.02669	1.01660
270	1.05088	1.04602	1.04164	1.03653	1.02555	1.01551
271	1.04973	1.04486	1.04047	1.03537	1.02441	1.01441
272	1.04857	1.04370	1.03930	1.03421	1.02326	1.01332
273	1.04742	1.04254	1.03814	1.03306	1.02212	1.01222
274	1.04627	1.04138	1.03697	1.03190	1.02098	1.01113
275	1.04511	1.04022	1.03581	1.03074	1.01983	1.01003
276	1.04396	1.03906	1.03464	1.02958	1.01869	1.00894
277	1.04281	1.03790	1.03347	1.02842	1.01755	1.00784
278	1.04166	1.03674	1.03231	1.02727	1.01641	1.00674
279	1.04050	1.03559	1.03114	1.02611	1.01526	1.00565
280	1.03935	1.03443	1.02997	1.02495	1.01412	1.00455
281	1.06263	1.05794	1.05390	1.04900	1.03793	1.02781
282	1.06161	1.05693	1.05288	1.04798	1.03696	1.02694
283	1.06059	1.05591	1.05187	1.04696	1.03600	1.02607
284	1.05957	1.05490	1.05085	1.04594	1.03503	1.02520
285	1.05855	1.05389	1.04983	1.04492	1.03406	1.02433
286	1.05753	1.05288	1.04882	1.04390	1.03310	1.02347
287	1.05652	1.05186	1.04780	1.04288	1.03213	1.02260
288	1.05550	1.05085	1.04679	1.04186	1.03117	1.02173
289	1.05448	1.04984	1.04577	1.04084	1.03020	1.02086
290	1.05346	1.04883	1.04475	1.03982	1.02923	1.01999
291	1.05244	1.04781	1.04374	1.03880	1.02827	1.01912
292	1.05143	1.04680	1.04272	1.03778	1.02730	1.01825
293	1.05041	1.04579	1.04170	1.03676	1.02633	1.01738
294	1.04939	1.04478	1.04069	1.03574	1.02537	1.01651
295	1.04837	1.04376	1.03967	1.03472	1.02440	1.01564
296	1.04735	1.04275	1.03865	1.03369	1.02343	1.01477
297	1.04633	1.04174	1.03764	1.03267	1.02247	1.01390
298	1.04532	1.04073	1.03662	1.03165	1.02150	1.01303
299	1.04430	1.03971	1.03561	1.03063	1.02054	1.01217
300	1.04328	1.03870	1.03459	1.02961	1.01957	1.01130
301	1.04226	1.03769	1.03357	1.02859	1.01860	1.01043
302	1.04124	1.03668	1.03256	1.02757	1.01764	1.00956
303	1.04023	1.03566	1.03154	1.02655	1.01667	1.00869
304	1.03921	1.03465	1.03052	1.02553	1.01570	1.00782

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
305	1.03819	1.03364	1.02951	1.02451	1.01474	1.00695
306	1.03717	1.03263	1.02849	1.02349	1.01377	1.00608
307	1.03615	1.03161	1.02748	1.02247	1.01280	1.00521
308	1.03513	1.03060	1.02646	1.02145	1.01184	1.00434
309	1.05700	1.05279	1.04895	1.04417	1.03414	1.02581
310	1.05608	1.05187	1.04804	1.04325	1.03324	1.02492
311	1.05517	1.05096	1.04712	1.04234	1.03233	1.02402
312	1.05426	1.05004	1.04621	1.04143	1.03143	1.02313
313	1.05335	1.04913	1.04529	1.04052	1.03052	1.02224
314	1.05244	1.04821	1.04438	1.03960	1.02962	1.02135
315	1.05153	1.04730	1.04347	1.03869	1.02871	1.02046
316	1.05062	1.04638	1.04255	1.03778	1.02781	1.01957
317	1.04971	1.04547	1.04164	1.03687	1.02691	1.01868
318	1.04880	1.04456	1.04072	1.03595	1.02600	1.01779
319	1.04789	1.04364	1.03981	1.03504	1.02510	1.01690
320	1.04698	1.04273	1.03889	1.03413	1.02419	1.01601
321	1.04606	1.04181	1.03798	1.03322	1.02329	1.01512
322	1.04515	1.04090	1.03706	1.03230	1.02238	1.01423
323	1.04424	1.03998	1.03615	1.03139	1.02148	1.01333
324	1.04333	1.03907	1.03523	1.03048	1.02057	1.01244
325	1.04242	1.03816	1.03432	1.02957	1.01967	1.01155
326	1.04151	1.03724	1.03341	1.02866	1.01876	1.01066
327	1.04060	1.03633	1.03249	1.02774	1.01786	1.00977
328	1.03969	1.03541	1.03158	1.02683	1.01695	1.00888
329	1.03878	1.03450	1.03066	1.02592	1.01605	1.00799
330	1.03787	1.03358	1.02975	1.02501	1.01514	1.00710
331	1.03696	1.03267	1.02883	1.02409	1.01424	1.00621
332	1.03605	1.03175	1.02792	1.02318	1.01334	1.00532
333	1.03513	1.03084	1.02700	1.02227	1.01243	1.00443
334	1.03422	1.02993	1.02609	1.02136	1.01153	1.00354
335	1.03331	1.02901	1.02518	1.02044	1.01062	1.00264
336	1.03240	1.02810	1.02426	1.01953	1.00972	1.00175
337	1.05310	1.04897	1.04528	1.04088	1.03216	1.02235
338	1.05227	1.04815	1.04446	1.04007	1.03131	1.02156
339	1.05145	1.04733	1.04364	1.03926	1.03046	1.02077
340	1.05063	1.04651	1.04282	1.03844	1.02961	1.01999
341	1.04980	1.04569	1.04200	1.03763	1.02876	1.01920
342	1.04898	1.04487	1.04118	1.03682	1.02791	1.01841
343	1.04816	1.04405	1.04037	1.03601	1.02706	1.01763
344	1.04734	1.04323	1.03955	1.03519	1.02622	1.01684
345	1.04651	1.04241	1.03873	1.03438	1.02537	1.01605
346	1.04569	1.04159	1.03791	1.03357	1.02452	1.01526
347	1.04487	1.04077	1.03709	1.03275	1.02367	1.01448
348	1.04404	1.03995	1.03627	1.03194	1.02282	1.01369
349	1.04322	1.03913	1.03546	1.03113	1.02197	1.01290
350	1.04240	1.03830	1.03464	1.03032	1.02112	1.01212
351	1.04158	1.03748	1.03382	1.02950	1.02028	1.01133
352	1.04075	1.03666	1.03300	1.02869	1.01943	1.01054
353	1.03993	1.03584	1.03218	1.02788	1.01858	1.00975
354	1.03911	1.03502	1.03136	1.02707	1.01773	1.00897
355	1.03828	1.03420	1.03055	1.02625	1.01688	1.00818
356	1.03746	1.03338	1.02973	1.02544	1.01603	1.00739
357	1.03664	1.03256	1.02891	1.02463	1.01518	1.00661
358	1.03582	1.03174	1.02809	1.02381	1.01434	1.00582
359	1.03499	1.03092	1.02727	1.02300	1.01349	1.00503
360	1.03417	1.03010	1.02645	1.02219	1.01264	1.00424
361	1.03335	1.02928	1.02564	1.02138	1.01179	1.00346

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
362	1.03252	1.02846	1.02482	1.02056	1.01094	1.00267
363	1.03170	1.02763	1.02400	1.01975	1.01009	1.00188
364	1.03088	1.02681	1.02318	1.01894	1.00924	1.00110
365	1.03006	1.02599	1.02236	1.01812	1.00840	1.00031
366	1.02923	1.02517	1.02154	1.01731	1.00755	0.99952
367	1.04869	1.04481	1.04132	1.03715	1.02815	1.01890
368	1.04795	1.04407	1.04059	1.03642	1.02743	1.01826
369	1.04722	1.04333	1.03986	1.03569	1.02670	1.01762
370	1.04648	1.04260	1.03912	1.03496	1.02598	1.01699
371	1.04575	1.04186	1.03839	1.03423	1.02525	1.01635
372	1.04501	1.04113	1.03765	1.03350	1.02453	1.01571
373	1.04428	1.04039	1.03692	1.03277	1.02380	1.01507
374	1.04354	1.03965	1.03619	1.03204	1.02308	1.01443
375	1.04281	1.03892	1.03545	1.03131	1.02235	1.01379
376	1.04207	1.03818	1.03472	1.03058	1.02162	1.01315
377	1.04134	1.03744	1.03398	1.02985	1.02090	1.01251
378	1.04060	1.03671	1.03325	1.02912	1.02017	1.01187
379	1.03987	1.03597	1.03252	1.02839	1.01945	1.01123
380	1.03913	1.03524	1.03178	1.02766	1.01872	1.01059
381	1.03840	1.03450	1.03105	1.02693	1.01800	1.00995
382	1.03766	1.03376	1.03031	1.02620	1.01727	1.00931
383	1.03693	1.03303	1.02958	1.02547	1.01655	1.00868
384	1.03619	1.03229	1.02884	1.02474	1.01582	1.00804
385	1.03546	1.03156	1.02811	1.02401	1.01510	1.00740
386	1.03472	1.03082	1.02738	1.02328	1.01437	1.00676
387	1.03399	1.03008	1.02664	1.02255	1.01364	1.00612
388	1.03325	1.02935	1.02591	1.02182	1.01292	1.00548
389	1.03252	1.02861	1.02517	1.02109	1.01219	1.00484
390	1.03178	1.02787	1.02444	1.02036	1.01147	1.00420
391	1.03105	1.02714	1.02371	1.01963	1.01074	1.00356
392	1.03031	1.02640	1.02297	1.01890	1.01002	1.00292
393	1.02958	1.02567	1.02224	1.01817	1.00929	1.00228
394	1.02884	1.02493	1.02150	1.01744	1.00857	1.00164
395	1.02811	1.02419	1.02077	1.01671	1.00784	1.00101
396	1.02737	1.02346	1.02004	1.01598	1.00711	1.00037
397	1.02664	1.02272	1.01930	1.01525	1.00639	0.99973
398	1.04487	1.04108	1.03781	1.03391	1.02503	1.01735
399	1.04421	1.04042	1.03715	1.03325	1.02437	1.01671
400	1.04354	1.03976	1.03648	1.03258	1.02371	1.01607
401	1.04288	1.03910	1.03582	1.03192	1.02305	1.01543
402	1.04221	1.03844	1.03516	1.03126	1.02239	1.01479
403	1.04155	1.03778	1.03449	1.03059	1.02173	1.01415
404	1.04088	1.03711	1.03383	1.02993	1.02107	1.01351
405	1.04022	1.03645	1.03317	1.02926	1.02041	1.01287
406	1.03955	1.03579	1.03250	1.02860	1.01975	1.01223
407	1.03889	1.03513	1.03184	1.02793	1.01909	1.01159
408	1.03822	1.03447	1.03118	1.02727	1.01843	1.01095
409	1.03756	1.03380	1.03051	1.02660	1.01777	1.01031
410	1.03689	1.03314	1.02985	1.02594	1.01710	1.00967
411	1.03623	1.03248	1.02919	1.02528	1.01644	1.00903
412	1.03556	1.03182	1.02852	1.02461	1.01578	1.00839
413	1.03490	1.03116	1.02786	1.02395	1.01512	1.00775
414	1.03423	1.03049	1.02720	1.02328	1.01446	1.00711
415	1.03357	1.02983	1.02653	1.02262	1.01380	1.00647
416	1.03290	1.02917	1.02587	1.02195	1.01314	1.00583
417	1.03224	1.02851	1.02521	1.02129	1.01248	1.00519
418	1.03158	1.02785	1.02454	1.02062	1.01182	1.00455

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
419	1.03091	1.02718	1.02388	1.01996	1.01116	1.00391
420	1.03025	1.02652	1.02322	1.01929	1.01050	1.00327
421	1.02958	1.02586	1.02255	1.01863	1.00984	1.00263
422	1.02892	1.02520	1.02189	1.01797	1.00918	1.00199
423	1.02825	1.02454	1.02123	1.01730	1.00852	1.00135
424	1.02759	1.02387	1.02056	1.01664	1.00786	1.00071
425	1.02692	1.02321	1.01990	1.01597	1.00720	1.00007
426	1.02626	1.02255	1.01924	1.01531	1.00654	0.99943
427	1.02559	1.02189	1.01857	1.01464	1.00588	0.99879
428	1.02493	1.02123	1.01791	1.01398	1.00522	0.99815
429	1.02426	1.02056	1.01725	1.01331	1.00455	0.99751
430	1.02360	1.01990	1.01658	1.01265	1.00389	0.99687
431	1.04110	1.03745	1.03418	1.03052	1.02236	1.01457
432	1.04050	1.03685	1.03359	1.02991	1.02176	1.01399
433	1.03990	1.03625	1.03299	1.02931	1.02116	1.01342
434	1.03929	1.03565	1.03239	1.02871	1.02056	1.01285
435	1.03869	1.03505	1.03179	1.02810	1.01995	1.01227
436	1.03809	1.03445	1.03119	1.02750	1.01935	1.01170
437	1.03749	1.03385	1.03059	1.02690	1.01875	1.01112
438	1.03688	1.03325	1.02999	1.02630	1.01815	1.01055
439	1.03628	1.03265	1.02940	1.02569	1.01755	1.00997
440	1.03568	1.03205	1.02880	1.02509	1.01694	1.00940
441	1.03507	1.03145	1.02820	1.02449	1.01634	1.00883
442	1.03447	1.03085	1.02760	1.02388	1.01574	1.00825
443	1.03387	1.03025	1.02700	1.02328	1.01514	1.00768
444	1.03327	1.02965	1.02640	1.02268	1.01454	1.00710
445	1.03266	1.02905	1.02580	1.02207	1.01393	1.00653
446	1.03206	1.02845	1.02521	1.02147	1.01333	1.00596
447	1.03146	1.02785	1.02461	1.02087	1.01273	1.00538
448	1.03086	1.02725	1.02401	1.02026	1.01213	1.00481
449	1.03025	1.02665	1.02341	1.01966	1.01152	1.00423
450	1.02965	1.02605	1.02281	1.01906	1.01092	1.00366
451	1.02905	1.02545	1.02221	1.01845	1.01032	1.00309
452	1.02844	1.02485	1.02161	1.01785	1.00972	1.00251
453	1.02784	1.02425	1.02102	1.01725	1.00912	1.00194
454	1.02724	1.02365	1.02042	1.01664	1.00851	1.00136
455	1.02664	1.02305	1.01982	1.01604	1.00791	1.00079
456	1.02603	1.02245	1.01922	1.01544	1.00731	1.00022
457	1.02543	1.02185	1.01862	1.01484	1.00671	0.99964
458	1.02483	1.02125	1.01802	1.01423	1.00611	0.99907
459	1.02423	1.02065	1.01742	1.01363	1.00550	0.99849
460	1.02362	1.02005	1.01683	1.01303	1.00490	0.99792
461	1.02302	1.01945	1.01623	1.01242	1.00430	0.99735
462	1.02242	1.01885	1.01563	1.01182	1.00370	0.99677
463	1.02182	1.01825	1.01503	1.01122	1.00310	0.99620
464	1.02121	1.01765	1.01443	1.01061	1.00249	0.99562
465	1.03769	1.03430	1.03122	1.02757	1.01995	1.01307
466	1.03714	1.03375	1.03067	1.02702	1.01939	1.01253
467	1.03659	1.03319	1.03012	1.02647	1.01884	1.01199
468	1.03604	1.03264	1.02957	1.02592	1.01828	1.01146
469	1.03549	1.03209	1.02902	1.02537	1.01773	1.01092
470	1.03494	1.03154	1.02847	1.02482	1.01717	1.01038
471	1.03439	1.03099	1.02791	1.02427	1.01662	1.00984
472	1.03384	1.03043	1.02736	1.02372	1.01606	1.00931
473	1.03329	1.02988	1.02681	1.02317	1.01551	1.00877
474	1.03274	1.02933	1.02626	1.02262	1.01495	1.00823
475	1.03219	1.02878	1.02571	1.02207	1.01440	1.00769

continued to next page...

Table S2: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the RankCover statistic***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
476	1.03164	1.02823	1.02516	1.02152	1.01384	1.00716
477	1.03109	1.02767	1.02461	1.02097	1.01329	1.00662
478	1.03054	1.02712	1.02406	1.02042	1.01273	1.00608
479	1.02999	1.02657	1.02351	1.01987	1.01218	1.00554
480	1.02944	1.02602	1.02296	1.01932	1.01163	1.00501
481	1.02889	1.02547	1.02241	1.01876	1.01107	1.00447
482	1.02834	1.02491	1.02186	1.01821	1.01052	1.00393
483	1.02779	1.02436	1.02131	1.01766	1.00996	1.00339
484	1.02724	1.02381	1.02076	1.01711	1.00941	1.00286
485	1.02669	1.02326	1.02021	1.01656	1.00885	1.00232
486	1.02614	1.02271	1.01966	1.01601	1.00830	1.00178
487	1.02559	1.02215	1.01911	1.01546	1.00774	1.00124
488	1.02504	1.02160	1.01856	1.01491	1.00719	1.00071
489	1.02449	1.02105	1.01801	1.01436	1.00663	1.00017
490	1.02394	1.02050	1.01746	1.01381	1.00608	0.99963
491	1.02340	1.01995	1.01691	1.01326	1.00552	0.99910
492	1.02285	1.01939	1.01636	1.01271	1.00497	0.99856
493	1.02230	1.01884	1.01580	1.01216	1.00441	0.99802
494	1.02175	1.01829	1.01525	1.01161	1.00386	0.99748
495	1.02120	1.01774	1.01470	1.01106	1.00330	0.99695
496	1.02065	1.01719	1.01415	1.01051	1.00275	0.99641
497	1.02010	1.01663	1.01360	1.00996	1.00219	0.99587
498	1.01955	1.01608	1.01305	1.00941	1.00164	0.99533
499	1.01900	1.01553	1.01250	1.00886	1.00108	0.99480
500	1.03464	1.03135	1.02835	1.02489	1.01768	1.01220

Table S3: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the hybrid p-values***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
20	0.06682	0.03219	0.01591	0.00659	0.00065	0.00007
21	0.06464	0.03226	0.01573	0.00632	0.00062	0.00005
22	0.06512	0.03175	0.01531	0.00620	0.00062	0.00006
23	0.06590	0.03182	0.01594	0.00618	0.00070	0.00007
24	0.06512	0.03226	0.01601	0.00647	0.00062	0.00006
25	0.06479	0.03165	0.01585	0.00622	0.00064	0.00006
26	0.06357	0.03102	0.01566	0.00631	0.00063	0.00006
27	0.06366	0.03112	0.01531	0.00607	0.00062	0.00007
28	0.06309	0.03098	0.01512	0.00599	0.00061	0.00007
29	0.06346	0.03038	0.01503	0.00600	0.00060	0.00006
30	0.06293	0.03024	0.01495	0.00590	0.00057	0.00005
31	0.06257	0.03042	0.01481	0.00586	0.00058	0.00007
32	0.06206	0.03057	0.01498	0.00579	0.00058	0.00006
33	0.06207	0.03016	0.01502	0.00606	0.00056	0.00005
34	0.06169	0.03010	0.01497	0.00592	0.00058	0.00005
35	0.06171	0.03003	0.01490	0.00584	0.00059	0.00005
36	0.06153	0.03016	0.01465	0.00572	0.00058	0.00007
37	0.06146	0.02965	0.01465	0.00574	0.00058	0.00005
38	0.06027	0.02944	0.01454	0.00565	0.00057	0.00006
39	0.06069	0.02942	0.01447	0.00566	0.00055	0.00005
40	0.06032	0.02926	0.01420	0.00564	0.00056	0.00005
41	0.06083	0.02960	0.01451	0.00572	0.00052	0.00006
42	0.05989	0.02923	0.01446	0.00574	0.00055	0.00005
43	0.06029	0.02928	0.01470	0.00577	0.00054	0.00005
44	0.06045	0.02904	0.01431	0.00558	0.00055	0.00006
45	0.05955	0.02907	0.01417	0.00570	0.00057	0.00005

continued to next page...

Table S3: ***Showing the p-th quantiles of the hybrid p-values***

Sample Sizes	p=0.1	p=0.05	p=0.025	p=0.01	p=0.001	p=0.0001
46	0.05950	0.02885	0.01419	0.00553	0.00054	0.00006
47	0.05953	0.02891	0.01410	0.00558	0.00055	0.00006
48	0.05962	0.02908	0.01415	0.00553	0.00055	0.00005
49	0.05952	0.02874	0.01410	0.00549	0.00054	0.00005
50	0.05903	0.02858	0.01417	0.00561	0.00053	0.00005
51	0.05913	0.02857	0.01412	0.00558	0.00055	0.00006
52	0.05933	0.02896	0.01406	0.00540	0.00053	0.00005
53	0.05925	0.02884	0.01417	0.00557	0.00053	0.00004
54	0.05918	0.02879	0.01408	0.00553	0.00052	0.00005
55	0.05867	0.02861	0.01393	0.00550	0.00055	0.00005
56	0.05871	0.02862	0.01423	0.00554	0.00052	0.00005
57	0.05874	0.02838	0.01382	0.00552	0.00056	0.00005
58	0.05874	0.02865	0.01394	0.00543	0.00053	0.00005
59	0.05868	0.02845	0.01408	0.00550	0.00052	0.00006
60	0.05843	0.02840	0.01378	0.00545	0.00053	0.00005
61	0.05849	0.02840	0.01398	0.00547	0.00055	0.00006
62	0.05806	0.02831	0.01390	0.00541	0.00052	0.00005
63	0.05810	0.02812	0.01372	0.00546	0.00053	0.00005
64	0.05832	0.02852	0.01391	0.00544	0.00053	0.00005
65	0.05770	0.02831	0.01386	0.00543	0.00054	0.00006
66	0.05831	0.02817	0.01378	0.00543	0.00052	0.00005
67	0.05779	0.02805	0.01379	0.00539	0.00051	0.00005
68	0.05776	0.02800	0.01379	0.00551	0.00054	0.00005
69	0.05768	0.02780	0.01356	0.00534	0.00052	0.00005
70	0.05776	0.02806	0.01382	0.00536	0.00054	0.00005
71	0.05744	0.02778	0.01368	0.00536	0.00053	0.00005
72	0.05746	0.02776	0.01363	0.00540	0.00053	0.00005
73	0.05736	0.02798	0.01370	0.00544	0.00052	0.00005
74	0.05709	0.02770	0.01358	0.00537	0.00053	0.00005
75	0.05712	0.02766	0.01352	0.00526	0.00051	0.00005
76	0.05675	0.02759	0.01362	0.00538	0.00053	0.00006
77	0.05669	0.02769	0.01355	0.00531	0.00053	0.00005
78	0.05698	0.02765	0.01361	0.00534	0.00052	0.00005
79	0.05656	0.02766	0.01354	0.00538	0.00053	0.00005
80	0.05704	0.02791	0.01359	0.00534	0.00053	0.00005
81	0.05709	0.02756	0.01352	0.00530	0.00051	0.00005
82	0.05706	0.02765	0.01360	0.00530	0.00051	0.00005
83	0.05659	0.02730	0.01336	0.00527	0.00052	0.00005
84	0.05707	0.02768	0.01363	0.00539	0.00051	0.00005
85	0.05680	0.02755	0.01347	0.00526	0.00052	0.00005
86	0.05686	0.02750	0.01362	0.00538	0.00054	0.00005
87	0.05707	0.02766	0.01352	0.00535	0.00053	0.00006
88	0.05655	0.02756	0.01347	0.00530	0.00051	0.00005
89	0.05685	0.02762	0.01352	0.00532	0.00051	0.00005
90	0.05624	0.02709	0.01332	0.00524	0.00053	0.00005
91	0.05628	0.02728	0.01343	0.00527	0.00053	0.00005
92	0.05639	0.02727	0.01346	0.00529	0.00051	0.00005
93	0.05645	0.02736	0.01344	0.00530	0.00051	0.00005
94	0.05645	0.02751	0.01347	0.00536	0.00051	0.00005
95	0.05639	0.02755	0.01353	0.00530	0.00051	0.00005
96	0.05637	0.02727	0.01341	0.00529	0.00051	0.00005
97	0.05646	0.02716	0.01337	0.00528	0.00051	0.00005
98	0.05668	0.02731	0.01350	0.00524	0.00050	0.00005
99	0.05615	0.02736	0.01346	0.00527	0.00053	0.00006
100	0.05616	0.02737	0.01343	0.00527	0.00052	0.00005

References

Bowman, A. and A. Azzalini (2013). R package sm: nonparametric smoothing methods (version 2.2-5).

Reshef, D. N., Y. A. Reshef, H. K. Finucane, S. R. Grossman, G. McVean, P. J. Turnbaugh, E. S. Lander, M. Mitzenmacher, and P. C. Sabeti (2011). Detecting novel associations in large data sets. *Science 334*(6062), 1518–1524.

Simon, N. and R. Tibshirani (2014). Comment on "detecting novel associations in large data sets" by reshef et al, science dec 16, 2011. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.7645*.

Troyanskaya, O., M. Cantor, G. Sherlock, P. Brown, T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, D. Botstein, and R. B. Altman (2001). Missing value estimation methods for dna microarrays. *Bioinformatics 17*(6), 520–525.